BLANK

PAGE

BLANK

PAGE

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1966

No. 1029, October Term, 1965

FRED B. BLACK, JR., PETITIONER

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM FOR THE UNITED STATES

This supplemental memorandum is submitted in response to this Court's order of June 13, 1966, requesting "a response from the Government in this case, not limited to, but directed in particular toward the kind of apparatus used by the Government; the person or persons who authorized its installation; the statute or Executive Order relied upon; the date or dates of installation; whether there is in existence a recording of conversations heard; when the information concerning petitioner came into the hands of any attorney for the Government and to which ones, as well as what use was made of the information in the case against petitioner."

1. The listening device referred to in our memorandum of May 24, 1966, was a tubular microphone which

225-044—66

was installed through the common wall of a room adjoining the suite occupied by petitioner at the Sheraton-Carlton Hotel in Washington, D.C. The microphone extended through the six-inch common wall and one-fourth of an inch into the one-half inch molding of petitioner's suite. It was installed on the afternoon of February 7, 1963, and agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation began to monitor conversations in petitioner's suite on the afternoon of the following day. The installation was removed and the monitoring was terminated on April 25, 1963.

No recording of any portion of the monitored conversations exists today. The assignment of the monitoring agents was to keep a contemporaneous log in which were summarized the conversations in petitioner's suite. A tape recorder was available and was used to record particular conversations whenever a monitoring agent felt that such a recording would be helpful in preparing his summaries. After the summaries were prepared, the used tape was erased.

While none of the recordings are, consequently, available today, the handwritten notes of the monitoring agents do exist. These notes summarize the conversations and, in some instances, contain excerpts from conversations.

2. No specific statute or executive order was relied upon in the installation of the listening device in question. Under 5 U.S.C. 300, the Attorney General has the authority to appoint officials for the detection and prosecution of crimes against the United States. In carrying out this responsibility, Attorneys General have delegated to the Director of the Federal Bureau

of Investigation the duty to gather intelligence, to investigate violations of federal laws, and to collect evidence in cases in which the United States is or may be a party. See 28 C.F.R. § 0.85 (1966 rev.).

An exception to the general delegation of authority has been prescribed, since 1940, for the interception of wire communications, which (in addition to being limited to matters involving national security or danger to human life) has required the specific authorization of the Attorney General in each instance. No similar procedure existed until 1965 with respect to the use of devices such as those involved in the instant case, although records of oral and written communications within the Department of Justice reflect concern by Attorneys General and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation that the use of listening devices by agents of the government should be confined to a strictly limited category of situations. Under Departmental practice in effect for a period of years prior to 1963, and continuing into 1965, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation was given authority to approve the installation of devices such as that in question for intelligence (and not evidentiary) purposes when required in the interest of internal security or national safety, including organized crime, kidnappings and matters wherein human life might be at stake. Acting on the basis of the aforementioned Departmental authorization, the Director approved installation of the device involved in the instant case.

Present Departmental practice, adopted in July 1965 in conformity with the policies declared by the

President on June 30, 1965, for the entire federal establishment, prohibits the use of such listening devices (as well as the interception of telephone and other wire communications) in all instances other than those involving the collection of intelligence affecting the national security. The specific authorization of the Attorney General must be obtained in each instance when this exception is invoked.

3. The information concerning petitioner obtained by the monitoring agents was submitted to their superiors in the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the form of the logs previously mentioned. Some of this information was then incorporated into two reports and two memoranda captioned "anti-racketeering" since these dealt with petitioner's possible affiliation with organized criminal activity in the United States.* The reports, dated April 17, 1963, and July 12, 1963, were transmitted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation to the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, and the memoranda, dated April 5, 1963, and April 9, 1963, were sent to the Attorney General with copies to the Criminal Division. The date on which the April 1963 report was received by attorneys in the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section is not known, but it was transmitted to the Office of the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division, where it was received on November 6, 1963. The July 1963 report was received in the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section on August 2, 1963, and

*Recital of these facts is not intended to suggest that any wrongdoing on the part of petitioner was uncovered by the monitoring.

in the Office of the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division on October 28, 1963. The memoranda were received in the Office of the Attorney General on April 5 and April 9, 1963, respectively.

Neither the reports nor the memoranda were seen by attorneys of the Tax Division responsible for the prosecution of the tax evasion charges against petitioner until January 1964 when, in preparing for trial, they requested from the Criminal Division such material as the latter possessed concerning petitioner. The F.B.I. reports and memoranda were included in the material transmitted pursuant to this request. They were received and examined by the Tax Division attorneys some time between January 31, 1964, and April 15, 1964, when petitioner's trial began.

The bulk of the information contained in the reports had been obtained from sources other than the monitoring. Neither the reports nor the memoranda indicated that any portion of the information was derived from a listening device.

The Tax Division attorneys found nothing in the F.B.I. reports or memoranda which they considered relevant to the tax evasion case. No information from these reports or memoranda (whether obtained from the listening device or from any other source) was used by government counsel in petitioner's tax evasion trial. The charges against petitioner in this case were based upon his failure to include in his income tax returns for 1956 through 1959 certain specific items of income. The proof that petitioner had received these items in those tax years was ob-

tained not by the Federal Bureau of Investigation but by agents of the Internal Revenue Service in an investigation begun in the spring of 1960 and concluded late in 1962. On December 12, 1962, the Internal Revenue Service referred the case to the Tax Division of the Department of Justice for criminal prosecution. All evidence produced by the government at petitioner's trial was detailed in an accompanying report of the Internal Revenue Service. Neither additional evidence nor any lead to additional evidence was obtained from the F.B.I. reports and memoranda.

In connection with an inquiry on an unrelated matter, the F.B.I. informed the Attorney General and the Criminal Division in late August 1965 that a listening device had been installed in petitioner's hotel suite. The logs were then obtained and reviewed within the Criminal Division in connection with the unrelated matter. However, the fact that conversations between petitioner and counsel whom he had then retained had been overheard was not noted by any attorney in the Department of Justice until after April 21, 1966, when the logs were again examined, this time by attorneys in the Tax Division who were familiar with the history of petitioner's case. They completed their review in early May and brought this fact to the attention of the Attorney General. At his direction, the Solicitor General was advised on May 10, 1966, that a listening device had been in operation in petitioner's hotel suite and that such conversations

had been overheard, and our memorandum of May 24, 1966, was accordingly filed in this Court.

Respectfully submitted.

THURGOOD MARSHALL,
Solicitor General.

JULY 1966.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1966